Case 1:17-cr-00630-ER Document 93 Filed 07/08/19 Page 1 of 8

J669IGNC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 17 CR 630 (ER) v. 5 KONSTANTIN IGNATOV, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. June 6, 2019 9 10:34 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. EDGARDO RAMOS 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York CHRISTOPHER J. DIMASE 17 NICHOLAS S. FOLLY Assistant United States Attorneys 18 NEW YORK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE JULIETA V. LOZANO 19 20 JEFFREY H. LICHTMAN JEFFREY B. EINHORN 21 Attorneys for Defendant 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

MR. DIMASE: Good morning, your Honor. Christopher Dimase for the government. I'm joined at counsel table by Special Assistant United States Attorney Julieta Lozano from the Manhattan D.A.'s Office and AUSA Nick Folly.

MR. LICHTMAN: Jeffrey Lichtman and Jeffrey Einhorn for Konstantin Ignatov. Good morning, Judge.

MR. EINHORN: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning to you all.

This matter is on for an initial conference. So Mr. Dimase, tell me a little bit about this case and the discovery, etc.

MR. DIMASE: Yes, your Honor. Let me just briefly give you a procedural history of how we got to today.

Mr. Ignatov was arrested actually in Los Angeles on March 6. The complaint in this case was filed under seal the following day, on March -- actually, I believe it was on March 5. And on March 6 Mr. Ignatov was arrested in Los Angeles. He was presented the following day, on March 7, in Los Angeles and was detained after a bail hearing there. He was ordered removed to the Southern District of New York for proceedings on that complaint. He ultimately did appear for the first time here in the Southern District on March 27. On that date he was presented on the complaint. There was one rollover of speedy trial time after that presentment. And

eventually, this was a week ago Tuesday, which I believe was May 28, Mr. Ignatov appeared in magistrate court, waived indictment, and a one-count superseding information was filed against him on that date. Mr. Ignatov entered a plea of not guilty and waived speedy trial time until today for a conference before this court. So that's the procedural posture where we are.

I did send a copy of the complaint, which is a lengthy, quite detailed presentation of the facts of this case to the court a week or two ago. But essentially the allegations are that Mr. Ignatov had a very high level position at this entity called OneCoin, which the government alleges is a fraud scheme involving the sale of a fraudulent cryptocurrency. Many, many details concerning the evidence against Mr. Ignatov and coconspirators are included in the complaint that's been filed and provided to the Court so I won't reiterate that all here.

I would note that the government has turned over a significant amount of discovery to Mr. Ignatov, including the following items: A video recorded postarrest statement made by the defendant, the entirety of a phone — the analysis of the phone that was recovered from him at the time of his arrest, several notebooks or journals that were recovered from him pursuant to his arrest, and I would note for the Court that the government did obtain a search warrant in order to search those

notebooks and the phone. But we've turned those items over even before the information was filed. And there are a few other assorted smaller pieces of discovery that were produced as well.

There is quite a bit of discovery in this case, as the Court is aware from presiding over other related matters. And I can go through a couple of the categories. I won't list every single type of discovery. But, among other things, there are phone records and other pen register related records; video recordings of many, many conferences and gatherings held by OneCoin at which various misrepresentations were made; bank records from many, many financial institutions all over the world; and MLAT — responses to MLAT requests from a number of different countries around the world; and a substantial amount of electronic data, particularly e-mail evidence obtained by the government pursuant to judicially authorized search warrants. So those are some of the more substantial categories of discovery in the case.

What we are asking, given the massive amount of discovery here, is to basically set an initial date for a first production of discovery which would go out in approximately one month and then make any rolling discoveries that are requested by the defense after that date.

I understand that Mr. Lichtman on behalf of his client is prepared to consent to that schedule.

If the Court has any other questions, I'm happy to address them but that's where we stand.

THE COURT: What is the status of discovery with respect to the related defendants? Is discovery complete from the government's perspective with respect to those?

MR. DIMASE: Your Honor, there are still probably some assorted items but it's largely complete. That being said, the government continues to gather additional records and evidence and is producing those on a rolling basis as well. So I can't say that it's complete for that — for primarily that reason, along with some small outstanding items as well.

THE COURT: But you are prepared to begin to produce discovery to Mr. Ignatov within one month?

MR. DIMASE: That's correct, your Honor. In addition to what we've already produced prior to today.

THE COURT: Mr. Lichtman.

MR. LICHTMAN: Yes, Judge. That's fine. We understand there's a huge amount of discovery, and they were kind enough to provide huge minus a little to us prior to the information being filed, so we're working through that and getting appropriate computers. The amount of material is so much that it broke a couple of the computers in our office. So we had to visit the store and get new ones. But that's fine.

I think, also, Mr. Ignatov has not been arraigned; is that correct?

MR. DIMASE: Your Honor, my understanding is he was arraigned at the conference in magistrate court on the $28^{\mbox{th}}$ of May and entered a not guilty plea at that time.

THE COURT: If he waived indictment, then he -MR. LICHTMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. So when do folks want to come back? When does it make sense to come back?

MR. DIMASE: I think the parties are in agreement on a date about six weeks out as a status conference. Obviously, if there's a change we can appraise the Court by letter prior to that date.

I would just note that with respect to the large amount of discovery that Mr. Lichtman was referring to that crashed their computers, the phone that was recovered from Mr. Ignatov had a substantial amount of digital data on it, so much that it can be difficult without a very modern computer to open it and access the data. And so we've actually produced that data twice to make sure that Mr. Ignatov was able to access it.

But, anyway, a six-week period for pretrial status conference I think makes sense here.

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, just a couple of issues. One is I'm not certain how it's going to work with the MDC -- excuse me, MCC, with regard to him seeing the discovery that we received. I know that they have their own rules, the amount of

the discovery. I will try to work with counsel from the MCC to see if we can resolve that so he can actually review that material, the voluminous nature and type of material that it is, it may require him to have a special laptop in the MCC as opposed to what they normally provide there, sort of ancient computers, but we'll get back to you if we have any issue with that.

Secondly, we do anticipate filing a bail motion that would obviate the need for waiting six weeks before we see you again. It may be sooner. But once that's done and submitted obviously we'll be back.

THE COURT: I'm happy to see you as soon as you're prepared to go forward.

So Ms. Rivera, six weeks out.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: July 19 at 11:30 a.m.

THE COURT: Does that date work for everyone?

MR. LICHTMAN: That's fine.

MR. DIMASE: Yes, your Honor. That's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. Dimase, is there anything else that we need to do today?

MR. DIMASE: Yes, your Honor. The government would request the exclusion of speedy trial time from today until the 19th of July in order to allow the government to produce additional discovery materials to Mr. Ignatov, to allow counsel to review the materials that have already been produced and

Case 1:17-cr-00630-ER Document 93 Filed 07/08/19 Page 8 of 8

J669IGNC

additionally any new materials the government produces in the next four weeks.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. LICHTMAN: We have no objection.

THE COURT: There being no objection, I will exclude the time between now and our next status conference under the speedy trial clock for the reasons set forth on the record by Mr. Dimase.

Unless there's anything else, we are adjourned.

(Adjourned)